

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN
SOUTHERN DIVISION

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff,

-v-

Case No. 17-cr-20183-7

CHARLES THOMAS FORD, JR.,

Defendant.

_____/

SENTENCING HEARING

BEFORE THE HONORABLE MARK A. GOLDSMITH

Detroit, Michigan, Wednesday, March 30th, 2022.

APPEARANCES:

FOR THE PLAINTIFF: LISANDRA DEL CARMEN FERNANDEZ-SILBER
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE
211 W. Fort Street, Room 2001
Detroit, MI 48226

FOR THE DEFENDANT: CHARLES O. LONGSTREET, II
Longstreet Law Firm, PLLC
18917 Livernois
Detroit, MI 48221

David B. Yarbrough, CSR, RMR, FCRR
Official Court Reporter
(313) 234-2619

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PAGE

WITNESSES:

NONE

EXHIBITS

NONE

1 Detroit, Michigan.

2 Wednesday, March 30th, 2022.

3 At or about 2:10 p.m.

4 -- --- --

5 THE CLERK OF THE COURT: The United States District
6 Court for the Eastern District of Michigan is now in session,
7 the Honorable Mark Goldsmith presiding. The Court calls -- I'm
8 sorry, actually you can be seated. Court calls case number
9 17-20813, defendant number seven, United States of America
10 versus Charles Ford. Counsel, please place your appearance on
11 the record.

12 MS. FERNANDEZ-SILBER: Good afternoon, your Honor.
13 Lisandra Fernandez-Silber and Jerome Gorgon on behalf of the
14 United States.

15 MR. LONGSTREET: Good afternoon, your Honor. May it
16 please this Honorable Court, Charles Oliver Longstreet the
17 Second, P68205, appearing on behalf of Mr. Charles Thomas Ford
18 who is standing to my right -- to my left, excuse me.

19 THE COURT: Good afternoon. Everyone can be seated
20 and I suggest you remain seated even when you're addressing the
21 Court so that you can speak directly into the microphone and
22 that will help us with being heard.

23 All right, this is the date and time set for
24 sentencing. Is everyone ready to proceed?

25 MS. FERNANDEZ-SILBER: Yes, your Honor.

1 MR. LONGSTREET: Yes.

2 THE COURT: All right. Have the attorneys gone over
3 the presentence investigation report?

4 MS. FERNANDEZ-SILBER: Yes, your Honor, I have.

5 MR. LONGSTREET: The defense has as well.

6 THE COURT: All right. Are there any corrections or
7 additions for the report?

8 MS. FERNANDEZ-SILBER: Not for the government.

9 MR. LONGSTREET: Respectfully on behalf of the
10 defendant, defense continues its objections as mentioned in our
11 sentencing memorandum as to line item number 24, vulnerable
12 victims, line item 25 and line item 26 as these were items that
13 were negotiated between the United States and the defense that
14 both parties agreed to a certain guideline scoring. We did
15 accept guideline scoring for maintaining a drug premises and
16 also, and in number -- and the amount of drugs that was
17 present, however we object to the scoring, additional scoring
18 of the probation department which scores two points for
19 vulnerable victims, two points for defendant is organizer,
20 leader or manager and scores two points for the number of
21 victims involved in the case. These are all things that were
22 negotiated between the defense and the United States
23 government. They were considered and not a part of the
24 guideline scoring between the parties and I object to them
25 being added to the presentence investigation report.

1 THE COURT: All right. What's the government's view
2 of this?

3 MS. FERNANDEZ-SILBER: Your Honor, in the Rule 11
4 Plea Agreement, the parties did agree to certain enhancements,
5 however the parties did not agree as to a guideline range and
6 in our negotiations we simply agreed to disagree about certain
7 enhancements. Of course probation makes its own determination
8 and in the PSR at the time the parties had to object to that,
9 the defendant make those objections, it was only later and the
10 government also notes that the defendant in the Rule 11 Plea
11 Agreement acknowledged that there were many women residing and
12 frequenting at the Victory Inn that were drug addicts and that
13 were victims of a sex trafficking conspiracy that was operated
14 by the same individuals that Mr. Ford bought his drugs from and
15 he also acknowledged that as a member of the drug trafficking
16 conspiracy, he was able to and did sell controlled substances
17 to these women and their commercial sex dates and that's on
18 page four and page nine of the Rule 11 Plea Agreement. So the
19 government's position is that probation correctly scored those
20 enhancements.

21 THE COURT: All right. Let's -- well, let me ask
22 counsel. There's a statement in the defense sentencing
23 memorandum that the enhancements that are in lines 23, 24, 25
24 and 26 of the report were specifically excluded by the parties,
25 but when I look at the plea agreement, I'm not seeing that

1 specifically. Are you saying it's in here, counsel?

2 MR. LONGSTREET: Actually I'm not saying it's -- not
3 enumerated --

4 THE COURT: You can remain seated and stay close to
5 the microphone, please.

6 MR. LONGSTREET: Very well. That is not enumerated
7 in the --

8 THE COURT: Not that close.

9 MR. LONGSTREET: Very well. It's not specifically
10 enumerated in the Rule 11 agreement. Specifically line item
11 23, that's maintaining a drug premises. That's something we
12 did agree to so that would be in error, however lines, 24, 25,
13 26 were just items that were discussed between myself and the
14 government. There was at least three months of negotiation in
15 this matter to get to final resolution. The parties and I did
16 discuss the -- excuse me, the government and I did discuss the
17 guideline range, the enhancements, the scoring, why I felt
18 those shouldn't be counted, the charge in which he was being,
19 my client was pleading to all came into factors in how we came
20 up to the negotiated number of 84 to 144 months based on what
21 we believed to be fairly dealing between the defense and the
22 government. For the probation department to then to intercede
23 and add things to the presentence investigation report from
24 which the parties, the lawyers in the case specifically
25 discussed and then add into the presentence investigation

1 report, we have objections to.

2 Specifically supporting our argument is that my
3 client pled to a drug offense. In our sentencing memorandum,
4 we specifically indicate that my client maintains his innocence
5 is as to human trafficking. The victims in this specific case
6 involve, the women that are involved in human trafficking are
7 victims. We didn't plead to a human trafficking offense. The
8 victims in the case are associated with human trafficking, thus
9 I don't believe that my client should be responsible for
10 victims of which, one, he didn't plead to; two, maintains his
11 innocence and three, has accepted responsibility for his role
12 that he did play.

13 THE COURT: All right. Well, whether they should be
14 scored is a separate issue. What you're talking about is
15 there's no basis to score them, but when I read your sentencing
16 memorandum, you were saying that there was actually an
17 agreement to exclude them. That's what you wrote here, they
18 were specifically excluded by the parties in the negotiated
19 guideline calculation, but all a matters is the written Rule 11
20 Plea Agreement, right?

21 MR. LONGSTREET: I would agree.

22 THE COURT: All right. So you're going to have to
23 point to something in this written agreement that talks about
24 how to score if you're going to make an argument based on an
25 agreement. You might have a different argument based on

1 there's no facts in the record that would support scoring these
2 variables, frankly an argument you can make about scoring of
3 any variable in any sentencing, but I want to first address
4 this issue that you're raising in your memorandum that there
5 was an agreement.

6 MR. LONGSTREET: I wouldn't specify specifically
7 there was an agreement, only there was a discussion between the
8 paste and those were excluded as part of our discussions in the
9 negotiations. It is most certainly not written in the Rule 11
10 agreement. Specifically the Rule 11 agreement says that the
11 probation department would make a determination as to what the
12 guideline scoring is. We just make an objections based on our
13 negotiation between the government and the defense and also the
14 factual basis for which they are being applied.

15 THE COURT: All right. So if your argument is based
16 on an agreement, I think you've acknowledged now that it's not
17 reflected in the Rule 11 Plea Agreement. Would you agree with
18 that?

19 THE DEFENDANT: I would agree.

20 THE COURT: All right. So whether or not there was
21 some discussion, even if there was an oral agreement, that's
22 not going to be enforceable. Every time I take a guilty plea,
23 I ask the defendant are there any agreements other than what's
24 in the written agreement between the government and the
25 defendant and that defendant would always tell me no, nothing

1 other than what's in the written agreement unless there is
2 something else that I need to know about. Now I haven't gone
3 back over the transcript in this case with Mr. Ford, but I'd be
4 willing to bet a lot of money I asked him that question and he
5 told me there's no other agreements other than what's in this
6 written plea agreement. Now I think therefore what we have now
7 is a question of whether there's a basis in the record to score
8 these variables, not based on an agreement, but whether there's
9 evidence to support them.

10 MR. LONGSTREET: I would concur.

11 THE COURT: All right. So let's look at that then.

12 MR. LONGSTREET: Very well.

13 THE COURT: So 23 you now acknowledge should be
14 scored; is that right?

15 THE COURT: Yes.

16 THE COURT: Okay. So let's turn to paragraph 24.
17 This has to do with victims, according to the presentence
18 investigation report, victims in this case had drug addictions
19 and were dependent on Ford for drugs, the defendant knew or
20 should have known the victim of the offense was a vulnerable
21 victim, therefore two levels are added, right? Now that's
22 something you are objecting to, right?

23 MR. LONGSTREET: I am, sir.

24 THE COURT: Okay, so let's focus on that now. Let me
25 hear the government's response to the defense argument that the

1 plea here was to drug charge, not to human trafficking charges
2 and I take it the argument of the defense is that there are no
3 victims of the drug offense to which Mr. Ford pled; is that
4 right?

5 MR. LONGSTREET: That is correct.

6 THE COURT: All right. So let me hear the
7 government's response to that.

8 MS. FERNANDEZ-SILBER: Your Honor, I would point the
9 Court to pages eight and nine of the Rule 11 Plea Agreement.
10 That's under the section titled Factual Stipulations For
11 Sentencing Purposes and on page nine, it specifically discusses
12 in the plea agreement that members of the conspiracy
13 distributed illegal narcotics to vulnerable human trafficking
14 victims at the Victory Inn. As vulnerable victims, they were
15 unusually vulnerable due to a physical condition, mental
16 condition or particularly susceptible to the criminal conduct.

17 Specifically, members of the drug trafficking
18 conspiracy distributed controlled substances to these victims
19 who are highly addicted to cocaine or heroine, the defendant
20 Mr. Ford knew or should have known that members of a separate
21 sex trafficking conspiracy used the narcotics sold to the
22 victims to control and coerce those victims into committing
23 commercial sex acts at the Victory Inn and other locations.

24 Members of the drug trafficking conspiracy have these
25 sex trafficking victims as part the commercial sex acts sell

1 controlled substances to their clients or Johns substantially
2 increasing their profit margin and at the plea agreement or the
3 plea hearing, excuse me, the Court went over these factual
4 stipulations and the defendant specifically agreed that they
5 were accurate.

6 THE COURT: All right. Now give me the defense
7 response to that.

8 MR. LONGSTREET: That is in the Rule 11 agreement,
9 however, it doesn't specifically say that my client
10 participated in the sex trafficking, only that he knew or
11 should have known that these drug, the drugs that he was
12 selling were being given to women who were using drugs. It
13 doesn't specifically say that he participated in the human
14 trafficking, only that he knew about it or should have known
15 about it. It doesn't say that he participated in it.

16 THE COURT: Well, the section that the attorney for
17 the government just read starts out by saying and this is on
18 page eight the following factual stipulations include acts
19 committed, aided, abetted or willfully caused by the defendant
20 and reasonably foreseeable acts of others and then that section
21 that the government attorney just read concludes with a
22 statement the parties agree to these additional factual
23 stipulations for sentencing purposes. So I don't quite
24 understand your argument that we can't score the variable for
25 victims. Maybe you can explain that. What is this doing in

1 the Rule 11 agreement that your client signed if it has nothing
2 to do with sentencing? What does it have to do with that?

3 MR. LONGSTREET: We entered into this particular
4 agreement with the understanding that my client would not be
5 admitting to and/or agreeing to any participation in the human
6 sex trafficking portion. This particular paragraph only speaks
7 to his knowledge as to what was going on at the, the Victory
8 Inn, however his participation in the human trafficking, he had
9 nothing to do with so at the time that we agreed to this, it
10 was our understanding that sure, he knew there was human, there
11 was women selling their bodies at this particular hotel, but
12 his participation in forcing them to go to participate in human
13 trafficking, umm, coercing them into human trafficking, that is
14 not something that he was a part of, that is not something that
15 he admits to, only that he knew or should have known that the
16 drugs that he was using and sharing were also being used or
17 sold by other persons as part of this conspiracy and those
18 persons were committing human sex trafficking acts, not him.

19 THE COURT: So if they wouldn't have been scored for
20 paragraph 24, 25, what would they have been scored for? Why
21 would there be a paragraph in the Rule 11 that says the parties
22 agree to these additional factual stipulations for sentencing
23 purposes? What sentencing purpose would this paragraph be used
24 for?

25 MR. LONGSTREET: In this instance, it's a C plea and

1 the guidelines in the sentencing is limited. For purposes of
2 sentencing, I don't see having any impact, but for purposes of
3 it going to the Bureau of Prisons and it being part of his
4 permanent record, I do see significance in this, these items
5 being scored.

6 THE COURT: All right. So your argument would apply
7 to paragraph 24, also to paragraph 25 then? Is this right?

8 MR. LONGSTREET: Yes, sir.

9 THE COURT: Is there any separate or additional
10 argument for paragraph 25? This is the one that has to do with
11 large number of vulnerable victims.

12 MR. LONGSTREET: Again, indeed, large number of
13 vulnerable victims. Even the Rule 11 agreement is vague in
14 regards to the number of victims. Again, he's not admitting to
15 any parts in human trafficking. The victims are victims of
16 human trafficking. He didn't plea to it, he's not admitting to
17 it, he maintains his innocence to it.

18 THE COURT: All right. Let me ask the government
19 view on this scoring for 25, the large number of vulnerable
20 victims. Defense says there's nothing in the Rule 11 about the
21 number of victims, so what's the basis for large number of
22 victims?

23 MS. FERNANDEZ-SILBER: Your Honor, I would point the
24 Court to page four which is a part of the factual basis and in
25 that page, the paragraph that starts about the middle of the

1 page it states as a member of the drug trafficking conspiracy,
2 the defendant was allowed to rent rooms at the Victory Inn.
3 The defendant sold drugs and stored them in his room at the
4 Victory Inn. There were also copious amounts of women who were
5 significant drug users residing at and frequenting the Victory
6 Inn. Many of these women were victims of a sex trafficking
7 conspiracy operated by the same individuals who sold drugs to
8 the defendant. They directed the sex trafficking victims to
9 only purchase their drugs from members of the drug trafficking
10 conspiracy. As a member, the defendant was able to sell
11 controlled substances to these women.

12 THE COURT: All right. Well, the phrase copious
13 amounts of women is probably not the best use of the English
14 language.

15 MS. FERNANDEZ-SILBER: I would agree, your Honor.

16 THE COURT: But what does that translate into in
17 terms of a number? And is there anything in the record about
18 the number of women who were victimized?

19 MS. FERNANDEZ-SILBER: I think that the record
20 indicates there were a large amount of women, but I don't know
21 that there's going to be a specific number anywhere. I don't
22 think there is.

23 THE COURT: Well, the variable talks about a large
24 number of vulnerable victims.

25 MS. FERNANDEZ-SILBER: And I would just add to that

1 we of course provided all the discovery in the case to the
2 probation officer who reviewed that and I think upon review of
3 the discovery material, it's very clear that it is a large
4 number of women.

5 THE COURT: Well, what was given to probation and
6 what they reviewed, I don't know anything about. Now we're
7 here at a sentencing hearing. Now is the time to present me
8 with what the evidence is in the record regarding the number of
9 victims. I don't think you can even tell me that number. I
10 think you're telling me you can't tell me that number. We
11 don't know if it's five or 10 or 20 or 30, right? Do we? Do
12 you?

13 MS. FERNANDEZ-SILBER: I don't know the specific
14 number, your Honor.

15 THE COURT: So how would I know able to score this
16 variable as a large number if you can't even tell me how many
17 victims there were?

18 MS. FERNANDEZ-SILBER: Your Honor, I think that it's
19 difficult to say a specific number because there were a lot of
20 them, but I can say that there are at least over 30 victims
21 identified in the government's exhibit list at this time.

22 THE COURT: All right. What's the defense response
23 to that? Government says that there are 30 victims identified.

24 MR. LONGSTREET: Well, that's for trial. We are not
25 at trial. At this point they haven't shown anything to suggest

1 there's 30 more victims in regards to Mr. Charles Ford and who
2 he was involved with, umm, so I have difficulty in even with
3 copious, that's still vague. Copious also means taking
4 careful, being careful as well or being thorough so thorough
5 victim is a poor use of the English language, but it doesn't
6 tell us the number of victims. If they have 30 victims, then
7 that's an issue for trial, but we're not at trial. We're at
8 the sentencing phase and it's still unknown as to the number of
9 victims as part of what my client pled to.

10 THE COURT: All right. Well, I don't see how I can
11 make a ruling that there were a large number of victims based
12 on a government representation of how many victims there are on
13 some exhibit list or Exhibits and it's certainly nothing that
14 this defendant has agreed to, so it seems to me that there are
15 a few options. If you want to insist on that variable, I
16 suppose we could have a hearing on how many victims there were
17 and I could make behalf finding based on how many are presented
18 to me. Of course that's not going to happen today so we'd have
19 to adjourn the sentencing, otherwise I could not find based on
20 this record that I couldn't score the additional two points for
21 paragraph 25. What would the government like to do?

22 Before you answer that question, maybe probation can
23 tell us what is the significance of not scoring those two
24 points. If we scored the two points for paragraph 24, the two
25 points for paragraph 23, but not score the two points in

1 paragraph 25. What would that do to the guidelines, if
2 anything?

3 PROBATION OFFICER FRANCE: Your Honor --

4 THE COURT: Tell us your name first for the record,
5 please?

6 PROBATION OFFICER FRANCE: Lisa France, U.S.
7 probation. I just wanted to clarify also my original report, I
8 include the role enhancement which he's objecting to and I
9 removed that in the addendum phase, so in my new report he did
10 not get the two points so he keeps referring to paragraph 26,
11 but I did not include that in the final report, so I just
12 wanted to make that clear as well.

13 THE COURT: Thank you.

14 PROBATION OFFICER FRANCE: So if you took away those
15 two points, it would be 168 to 210 would be the guidelines.

16 THE COURT: 168 to 210?

17 PROBATION OFFICER FRANCE: Yep.

18 THE COURT: All right. Now let me hear from the
19 government, what would it like to do?

20 MS. FERNANDEZ-SILBER: Your Honor, we would like to
21 proceed with the sentencing just given that even with the lower
22 guideline range, it's still higher than what the government is
23 recommending in this case.

24 THE COURT: All right. I'm ready to rule unless
25 there's anything else from the defense?

1 MR. LONGSTREET: Nothing from the defense, thank you.

2 THE COURT: All right. So with respect to these
3 challenges, paragraph 23 of the presentence investigation
4 report does accurately reflect the agreement in the Rule 11
5 Plea Agreement regarding maintaining premises. That scoring
6 was agreed to, so 23's recitation of two points will be
7 sustained.

8 With respect to paragraph 24 that the victims in this
9 case had drug addictions and where defendant fund Mr. Ford for
10 drugs and that he knew or should have known that the victims of
11 the offense were vulnerable victims, I am going to score the
12 two points for that. I'm doing that because although there
13 were distinct conspiracies and this defendant only pled to the
14 drug conspiracy, not the human trafficking conspiracy, the
15 conspiracies are interrelated and the victims were victimized
16 in two senses. One was in terms of the human trafficking, but
17 also in terms of the drug trafficking to which this defendant
18 pled guilty.

19 The drugs were used to control and coerce the victims
20 into committing commercial sex acts. That's what this
21 defendant acknowledged in the Rule 11 Plea Agreement. He did
22 not plead guilty to a human trafficking or sex trafficking
23 conspiracy, but he acknowledged the interrelationship between
24 the drugs and the sex trafficking activity so I think the only
25 reasonable interpretation of the factual stipulation that

1 appears on page nine of the Rule 11 is that Mr. Ford
2 acknowledged that his drug trafficking activity contributed to
3 the victimization of these women and that they were vulnerable
4 because they were drug addicts and therefore it's proper to
5 score the two points for paragraph 24.

6 With respect to paragraph 25, I am not going to score
7 the two points there. I do sustain the defense to be paragraph
8 25. The government is unable to show anything in the Rule 11
9 Plea Agreement or otherwise in the record where Mr. Ford
10 acknowledged how many victims were victimized and the
11 government's proposed substantiation of 30 victims based on
12 what might appear in Exhibits or on an exhibit list isn't
13 anything that would be binding on Mr. Ford and the government
14 is, has stated here that it doesn't want to adjourn this
15 hearing to mass and then produce to the Court evidence of the
16 number of victims so I'm not going to score the two points for
17 paragraph 25.

18 Probation has already clarified that there is no
19 scoring for role in the offense, paragraph 26, which was
20 another objection set out by the defense in its sentencing
21 memorandum. All right, so any other objections?

22 MR. LONGSTREET: None from the defense. Thank you.

23 THE COURT: All right. Now I just want to clarify
24 you did go over the presentence investigation report with Mr.
25 Ford, correct?

1 MR. LONGSTREET: I did go over the presentence
2 investigation report. Other than the objections that have been
3 stated there are no other corrections, additions or deletions
4 to be made to the presentence investigation report.

5 THE COURT: Okay. So let's simply recite on the
6 record again that Mr. Ford did plead guilty to count one of the
7 third superseding information under a Rule 11 Plea Agreement.
8 The Court accepted the guilty plea, took the Rule 11 Plea
9 Agreement under advisement. Are both sides still urging the
10 Court to adopt it?

11 MS. FERNANDEZ-SILBER: Yes, your Honor.

12 MR. LONGSTREET: Yes.

13 THE COURT: I do adopt it and now we can turn to the
14 calculation of the guidelines. We've been discussing how to
15 score certain variables, but let's do the calculation. The
16 report utilized the November 1, 2021 guidelines manual. Base
17 offense level of 32, add two levels for maintaining premises
18 for purposes of manufacturing and distributing a controlled
19 substance. I've added two levels because the victims in the
20 case had drug addictions and were dependent on Mr. Ford for
21 drugs and Mr. Ford knew or should have known that these victims
22 were vulnerable. As I've ruled, I'm not scoring the two levels
23 that appear in the report on paragraph 25 for large number of
24 vulnerable victims, so with a deduction of three levels for
25 acceptance of responsibility, I believe that makes the total

1 offense level 33. Is everyone in agreement with that based on
2 my rulings?

3 MS. FERNANDEZ-SILBER: Yes, your Honor.

4 MR. LONGSTREET: Defense agrees.

5 THE COURT: Let's turn to the scoring of criminal
6 history. The report says that Mr. Ford has four points for
7 prior convictions. Two points are added because he committed
8 the instant offense while under a criminal justice sentence.
9 That yields six points placing him in category three. Is
10 everyone in agreement with that?

11 MS. FERNANDEZ-SILBER: Yes, your Honor.

12 MR. LONGSTREET: I'm sorry, can the Court repeat
13 that, please?

14 THE COURT: He has four points for prior convictions,
15 two points for having committed the instant offense while under
16 a criminal justice sentence and the six points puts him in
17 category three. Do you agree with that?

18 MR. LONGSTREET: Now that I think about it, the Court
19 has read that he was under a sentence at the time of the
20 instant offense? He was not.

21 THE COURT: All right. I'm looking at paragraph 53.
22 Do you have an objection to that then? Paragraph 53 says he
23 committed this offense while he was under a criminal justice
24 sentence out of the Third Circuit Court for possession of less
25 than 25 grams and also possession of paraphernalia out of the

1 19th district court. Do you object to that?

2 MR. LONGSTREET: Your Honor, the reason why I
3 would --

4 THE COURT: You can remain seated, counsel.

5 MR. LONGSTREET: Thank you. Now that I'm paying more
6 attention to it now that I see it, this is the case he was
7 arrested for. This is the case that got the whole ball rolling
8 so to say. Umm, because this is the matter that got the whole
9 ball rolling, he wasn't under the supervision of a court at the
10 time the instant offense was committed. He had been arrested
11 even before the raid happened, even before any of this was
12 really discovered so he would not have been under supervision
13 of the criminal courts because he didn't become under the
14 supervision of the criminal courts some time I do believe until
15 December of 2016 where he pled in front of Judge Deborah Thomas
16 of the Third Circuit Court to possession of, to possession of
17 narcotics and he was serving time in the Wayne County Jail at
18 the time that this, this raid happened on January I believe
19 17th of of 2017 when the entire Victory Inn case was
20 discovered. So technically he would not have been under
21 supervision of the Third Circuit Court at the time.

22 THE COURT: Well, the events of the instant case have
23 to do with crimes that took place in 2017 and he was under the
24 Third Circuit Court's probation sentence until August 31 of
25 2018.

1 MR. LONGSTREET: Respectfully, he was on probation
2 for the 2016 case at the time he was indicted on this case in
3 front of the Court. He had pled to the probation -- to the
4 drug offense, he was serving a jail sentence at the time that
5 he was actually indicted on this.

6 THE COURT: All right. So what's the government's
7 response to this?

8 MS. FERNANDEZ-SILBER: The government's position is
9 that Mr. Ford was under two criminal justice sentences when
10 these offenses -- when this offense was committed and that's
11 the one the Court pointed out for the Third Circuit Court for
12 possession less than 25 grams and also the one in 19th District
13 Court for possession of paraphernalia, umm, because these
14 offenses were taking place from 2015 to January of 2017, so he
15 would have been under a criminal justice sentence.

16 THE COURT: When you say these, you mean the crimes
17 he committed in this case for which he's convicted in this
18 Court?

19 MS. FERNANDEZ-SILBER: Yes, the conspiracy to
20 distribute controlled substances.

21 THE COURT: What's the time frame?

22 MS. FERNANDEZ-SILBER: From on or about 2015
23 continuing through on or about January 12th of 2017.

24 THE COURT: All right. Well, I'm looking at
25 paragraph 51 and it says that Mr. Ford was sentenced on

1 December 22 of 2016 to the six month custody and two years
2 probation, so doesn't that mean if the indictment span runs
3 into January of 2017, that he was under a criminal justice
4 sentence for the Third Circuit Court during the same time as he
5 was committing this offense?

6 MR. LONGSTREET: The accusation is that the
7 conspiracy occurred between the dates, an unknown date in 2015
8 through January 17th, 2017 when the federal agents and local
9 agents raided the Victory Inn, however at the time that the
10 raid occurred, at the time that he was indicted, at the time
11 that the conspiracy was discovered by the federal agents, Mr.
12 Ford was not on the scene. Mr. Ford was incarcerated. Mr.
13 Ford was serving a sentence in the Wayne County Jail.
14 Therefore it would be the position of the defense that he could
15 not have been committing the crimes while under supervision of
16 the Circuit Court when the crimes that were being committed
17 wasn't even discovered until well after he was off the scene.

18 THE COURT: Well, it doesn't make a difference when
19 the crime is discovered, right? Just makes a difference
20 whether he committed the instant offense while he was under
21 sentence of another court, right?

22 MR. LONGSTREET: Factually it does make a difference
23 to us in that there is no evidence that he was participating in
24 drug -- I mean in the conspiracy in 2015, umm --

25 THE COURT: Well, it says right in the Rule 11 on

1 page three, from in or around 2015 through November 12 of 2016.

2 MR. LONGSTREET: There was something going on at the
3 Victory Inn, we would agree with that. There was a lot going
4 on at the Victory Inn.

5 THE COURT: Well, page five at the very end of the
6 factual basis says that the defendant knew, should have known
7 or it was reasonably foreseeable to him that collectively from
8 in or around 2015 through November 12, 2016 the defendant and
9 his co-conspirators distributed at least 840 grams of cocaine
10 base, at least 100 grams of heroin. So that does meet the time
11 frame that Mr. Ford has agreed to that he was committing the
12 crime, the instant offense, right?

13 MR. LONGSTREET: I would imagine that being in the
14 Rule 11 and that's something we agreed to, that would nullify
15 our objection to line 53.

16 THE COURT: All right. So you have no objection to
17 scoring the additional two points?

18 MR. LONGSTREET: I cannot given that it's in the Rule
19 11 agreement. I can't.

20 THE COURT: All right. Anything else for the
21 government?

22 MR. LONGSTREET: No -- excuse me.

23 THE COURT: I'm sorry, for the government. Anything
24 else?

25 MS. FERNANDEZ-SILBER: No, your Honor.

1 THE COURT: All right. Let me clarify with
2 probation. Regarding the paragraph 50 in the report, it talks
3 about the possession of paraphernalia out of the 19th District
4 Court. Was the sentence there imposed on July 26th of 2017?

5 PROBATION OFFICER FRANCE: Yes, your Honor, but also
6 for criminal history purposes, we use the date in the
7 third-superseding information which says the offense occurred
8 from on or about 2015 and continuing on, continuing through on
9 or about November 12th, 2017, so that's typically the date
10 range we use because that's the date the offense was occurring,
11 but I'd also like to point out that he already has the four
12 points so even if you took the two points away, he'd be in the
13 same criminal history category of three, but our position is
14 that he deserves those two points for being under a sentence.

15 THE COURT: I guess what I'd like some clarity about
16 is it looks like in the two state cases, 19th District and the
17 Third Circuit Court he wasn't under a sentence until July 26th
18 of 2017; is that right?

19 PROBATION OFFICER FRANCE: That's correct. As of
20 that date falls in between the 2015 to November 12th, 2017
21 which is listed in the third-superseding information which is
22 he pled guilty to count one of the third-superseding
23 information.

24 THE COURT: So you're saying the third-superseding
25 information talks about 2017?

1 PROBATION OFFICER FRANCE: Yes, that it occurred from
2 2015 continuing on to on or about November 12th, 2017.

3 THE COURT: Well, the problem is that the Rule 11
4 talks about 2016, not 2017, right? It says that the defendant
5 was engaged in this from in or around 2015 through November 12
6 of 2016. You're saying the third-superseding actually extends
7 the time frame; is that right?

8 PROBATION OFFICER FRANCE: That's how my report's
9 written. That's what I thought. I don't have the
10 third-superseding information with me, but that's what's listed
11 in paragraph six of my report.

12 MR. LONGSTREET: May I proceed some clarification to
13 the Court?

14 THE COURT: Yes, please.

15 MR. LONGSTREET: It appears on page one of five of
16 the third-superseding indictment, the first paragraph says on
17 or about 2015 and continuing through on or about November 12th,
18 2017. That's a factual impossibility as all the members of the
19 conspiracy had been indicted by November, 2017. The November
20 12th, 2016 is the date my client got arrested by the Dearborn
21 police. This November 2017 date that appears is in our
22 estimation a typo. The actual factual basis would be an
23 unknown date of 2015 through January 17th, 2017 when the
24 Victory Inn was raided by the FB -- by the federal agents.

25 THE COURT: Well, I'm going by what is in the factual

1 basis in the Rule 11.

2 MR. LONGSTREET: Okay.

3 THE COURT: And it says it's from in or around 2015
4 through November 12th of 2016.

5 MR. LONGSTREET: I agree with that.

6 THE COURT: That's different than what is may the
7 third-superseding information because the third-superseding
8 information says from on or about 2015 and continuing through
9 on or about November 12, 2017.

10 MR. LONGSTREET: The '17 being a typo. Should be
11 '16.

12 THE COURT: All right. So if we go with 2016 as the
13 end point of his conduct in this case, that seems to predate
14 when he was sentenced in the state cases 'cause he was
15 sentenced July 26th of 2017. You're saying though it doesn't
16 make a difference.

17 PROBATION OFFICER FRANCE: It does not make a
18 difference in the criminal history category. He's a three
19 regardless.

20 THE COURT: All right. I'll give the government one
21 last shot to explain to me why we would be scoring this then
22 given what is in the factual basis in the Rule 11.

23 MS. FERNANDEZ-SILBER: Upon looking at it again, your
24 Honor, I think the Court is right that November 12, 2016 was
25 the date of the arrest of Mr. Ford and that and I don't think

1 he would have been under that sentence, so I don't think that
2 those two points should be scored.

3 THE COURT: All right. So the criminal history then
4 is four points, not six points, but he still is in category
5 three.

6 PROBATION OFFICER FRANCE: Correct.

7 THE COURT: All right. Everyone in agreement with
8 that?

9 MR. LONGSTREET: Yes.

10 THE COURT: All right.

11 MS. FERNANDEZ-SILBER: Yes, your Honor.

12 THE COURT: And with a total offense level of 33 and
13 a criminal history category of three, the guideline range is
14 168 to 210. Everyone in agreement with that?

15 MS. FERNANDEZ-SILBER: Yes, your Honor.

16 MR. LONGSTREET: Yes.

17 THE COURT: All right. Let's look at our sentencing
18 options. Maximum term of imprisonment is 20 years. Guideline
19 range is 168 to 210. The Rule 11 Plea Agreement provides that
20 the defendant's sentence shall not be more than 144 months and
21 not less than 84 months.

22 With respect to supervised release, statute provides
23 for a mandatory three years. Is that right?

24 MR. LONGSTREET: At least three years.

25 THE COURT: Is it three years to life? Is it three

1 years to life; is that right?

2 MS. FERNANDEZ-SILBER: Not less than three years and
3 up to life, that's correct.

4 THE COURT: All right and guidelines require at least
5 three years for supervised release. With respect to probation
6 the statute makes Mr. Ford eligible for not less than one year
7 nor more than five years of probation. He is not eligible
8 however under the guidelines.

9 Under the statute, maximum fine is one million
10 dollars. There's mandatory special assessment of 100 dollars.
11 Guideline fine range, does that change now or is it still
12 40,000 to a million dollars?

13 PROBATION OFFICER FRANCE: I believe it's still
14 40,000 to a million.

15 THE COURT: Okay. All right, restitution is not
16 applicable. Is everyone this agreement with that recitation of
17 our sentencing options?

18 MR. LONGSTREET: Defense agrees.

19 MS. FERNANDEZ-SILBER: Yes, your Honor.

20 THE COURT: All right. I'll hear from defense
21 counsel and then Mr. Ford when your attorney's done speaking,
22 you can address the Court yourself if you like. We'll hear
23 from the attorney for the government. All right, go ahead,
24 counsel.

25 MR. LONGSTREET: By way of allocution on behalf of

1 Mr. Charles Thomas Ford, the defense has done its best to
2 express our thoughts and feelings about the case and about
3 Mr. Ford in our sentencing memorandum, but I'm going to keep
4 my words short because I believe the most important sentencing
5 factor under 3553 is the person and my client will speak to the
6 Court himself to give the Court a good idea of who Mr. Charles
7 Thomas Ford the man is five years after his emancipation.

8 I will like to say that this case for Mr. Ford is
9 about repentance and redemption, repentance, understanding that
10 the conduct he engaged himself in was wrong. He's taken
11 responsibility for it, he's taken a plea for it. Now Mr. Ford
12 is looking for redemption, the opportunity to move forward with
13 his life.

14 Being a drug addict for a long period of time and
15 being off of it for five years provides a man a bit of clarity.
16 It provides a bit of when they say looking back is 20/20
17 vision, well, for a drug addict it's X-ray vision because it
18 allows to you look deeper into yourself, that you've made
19 decisions that you ordinarily would not have made given that if
20 were you not under the slavery of drug addiction. Thoughts are
21 different, actions are different, spirit is different, behavior
22 is different.

23 Now that he's been clean for five years, you're
24 looking at a person who would not make the same decisions that
25 he made five years ago. You're looking at a person who's

1 thinking differently, not that he was a bad person in the first
2 place, he was a drug addict. He behaved like a drug addict.
3 He did drug addict things and he has admitted to his wrong and
4 he's ready to move forward. He's looking for a new day. He's
5 looking to get out and be back with his family, back to
6 Thanksgiving dinners and Christmases and having holidays with
7 his family versus being in a drug-induced state.

8 Mr. Charles Thomas Ford has dreams, goals that he
9 wants to accomplish once he gets out and hoping that he doesn't
10 have to spend a significant more amount of time in prison.
11 He's looking for forgiveness from the Court and he's looking
12 for a second chance and a chance to come back, come back better
13 than he's ever been before and he's hoping that he's not going
14 to be spending a significant amount of time. He feels like
15 he's ready, he's ready to return to society with with a new
16 attitude, a new hope and new dreams and he's ready to go,
17 Judge. Thank you.

18 THE COURT: All right. Thank you. Mr. Ford,
19 anything you'd like to he will me regarding sentencing?

20 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor. Can you hear me?

21 THE COURT: I can.

22 THE DEFENDANT: I will first like to apologize to
23 you, your Honor, for taking the Court's time up, the
24 government, my family and the community for my part that I
25 played in this conspiracy. My addiction had the best of me and

1 at the time, this disease had a strong hold. I was truly lost
2 and needed help desperately. I was walking around with my eyes
3 wide shut, missing the best parts of my life such as
4 communication, spending time with my family and true friends;
5 worship and things that make life so wonderful, but God, my
6 Father heard my cry, desperate and lost, looking for a way out.

7 Now, this disease had mentally, emotionally,
8 spiritually and I caught a drug case from this date and I
9 quickly asked Judge Thomas for help and she gave me 90 days in
10 jail and 90 days in the rehab. It was then that my life
11 started to change and I could start seeing the forest for the
12 trees.

13 Then came the indictment. I felt as if my life was
14 turned upside down, but God was still working with me. For the
15 next five years, I had a running start to get Charles together,
16 spiritually, emotionally, mentally and physically. I took
17 classes in jail such as drug and alcohol, alcohol PTSD, skills
18 for effective living, anger management and Bible class which I
19 taught some of the times myself. God knew just what I needed,
20 taking these classes along with lots of prayer from family and
21 friends and even from my lawyer.

22 THE COURT: All right, Mr. Ford, pardon me. I'm
23 going to ask you to keep your mask up.

24 THE DEFENDANT: Oh, okay.

25 THE COURT: I think I'll be able to hear you.

1 THE DEFENDANT: You can hear me? Okay, I'm sorry,
2 sir.

3 THE COURT: Keep it above your nose, please. Thank
4 you.

5 THE DEFENDANT: I felt my life coming together. My
6 family started noticing the drastic change in my behavior, my
7 speech. I wasn't thinking about being part of the problem, I
8 was working on being the solution to the situation.
9 Remembering how much I enjoyed life without drugs and partying.
10 I started mentoring in jail to young people letting them know
11 the damaging effects of drugs and how it breaks our spirit.

12 Now today five years later, I'm not the same person.
13 I have things to offer society such as 30 years worth of
14 managerial positions from running the family business. I have
15 eight certificates from food tech classes that I took. I have
16 asbestos, led and hazard law license, drug driving license and
17 a host of other things that I'm very good at like hanging
18 drywall, maintenance on houses. I even went to MCI to be an
19 auto mechanic.

20 If given the chance, your Honor, I would really love
21 to show myself, my family and the courts that I am somebody
22 worth saving and I have something to offer. I admit five years
23 did great for me, but now I feel it's time to show that I am
24 the solution and not the problem anymore. So whatever it
25 takes, I'm ready and willing to do. It took five years of my

1 being to get back my entire life and that, I am truly grateful
2 to you for, your Honor.

3 THE COURT: All right, thank you.

4 THE DEFENDANT: Thank you.

5 THE COURT: Anything for the government?

6 MS. FERNANDEZ-SILBER: Thank you, your Honor. As a
7 member of this drug trafficking conspiracy, Mr. Ford was able
8 to and did sell a very large quantity of controlled substances,
9 primarily crack cocaine, to many vulnerable human trafficking
10 victims and to their commercial sex dates who stayed at the
11 Victory Inn and the nature and circumstances of Mr. Ford's
12 offense call for a sentence of 144 months which is what the
13 government is recommending in this case.

14 This was a drug trafficking conspiracy of impressive
15 scale. During the short period of time that federal agents
16 were conducting surveillance, they observed hundreds of
17 suspected drug transactions and they then recovered extensive
18 evidence of drug use and distribution during the execution of
19 the search warrant at the Victory Inn.

20 Mr. Ford controlled rooms at the Victory Inn and he
21 used them to distribute crack to many human trafficking victims
22 which led the victims to then engage in commercial sex acts so
23 that they could continue to obtain those controlled substances
24 from Mr. Ford and his co-conspirators in order to maintain
25 their dependence on these drugs and this exploitation was

1 highly profitable to Mr. Ford and to his co-conspirators and
2 they turned the Victory Inn into a well-known one-stop shop for
3 drugs and commercial sex all day, every day.

4 Mr. Ford's criminal conduct at the Victory Inn went
5 on from at least 2015 to November 12th of 2016 and that's when
6 he was arrested with crack cocaine packaged for distribution in
7 his pocket. Mr. Ford's history and characteristics also
8 support a sentence of 144 months. He has no legitimate
9 employment history, he has at least five felony convictions
10 including for controlled substances and firearms and he's
11 violated parole and probation multiple times as is detailed in
12 the PSR.

13 In the government's view, a sentence of 144 months
14 would also reflect the seriousness of the offense, promote
15 respect for the law and provide just punishment. Mr. Ford saw
16 the vulnerabilities of drug-addicted women and then he made a
17 conscious decision to exploit them over and over again for his
18 own financial gain for at least a year.

19 According to victim one, many victims engaged in
20 commercial sex dates for Mr. Ford and would owe Mr. Ford money.
21 According to another witness, Mr. Ford would rent his room out
22 to girls for commercial sex dates, take all the proceeds from
23 the dates as payment for drugs and the rooms and force the
24 girls to go back to work doing more dates so they could repay
25 their drug debt to him and buy more drugs from him and

1 according to a co-conspirator, Mr. Ford would buy drugs, sell
2 drugs and pimp out girls.

3 A significant sentence is necessary to deter Mr. Ford
4 and others from engaging in this conduct in the future and to
5 protect the public given that prior probationary and custodial
6 sentences have not stopped Mr. Ford from continuing to threaten
7 the public through drug trafficking. Thank you, your Honor.

8 THE COURT: The Court must follow the requirements of
9 the statute that governs sentencing, that's Title 18 United
10 States Code, Section 3553. That statute requires a Court to
11 impose a sentence that is sufficient, but not greater than
12 necessary to achieve the purposes that are set out in the
13 statute. Those purposes are for a sentence to reflect the
14 seriousness of the offense, promote respect for the law,
15 provide just punishment for the offense, afford adequate
16 deterrence to criminal conduct, protect the public from further
17 crimes of the defendant, provide the defendant with needed
18 educational or vocational training, medical care or other
19 correctional treatment in the most effective manner.

20 The statute requires a Court to consider all
21 appropriate factors including the nature and circumstances of
22 the offense, the history and characteristics of the defendant,
23 the kinds of sentences that are available, sentencing guideline
24 range, pertinent policy statements of the Sentencing
25 Commission, the need to avoid unwarranted sentence disparities

1 among defendants with similar records who have been found
2 guilty of similar conduct and the need to provide restitution
3 where that's applicable. The Court takes into account all of
4 those factors in fashioning a sentence that it believes will be
5 sufficient, but not greater than necessary to accomplish the
6 statute's sentencing goals.

7 In terms of the seriousness of the offense, there's
8 no question that drug trafficking is a great plague in our
9 society. Drugs kill people, they hurt people, they hurt
10 communities. They destabilize our sense of security. Drugs
11 are a terrible misfortune and that is why our country punishes
12 illegal drug activity as severely as it does. Mr. Ford has
13 been part of that grievous activity that undermines the sense
14 of safety and basic welfare in our communities.

15 The specific context of this crime shows an
16 intersection with another terrible plague in our society, that
17 of human trafficking. Mr. Ford is not before the Court for
18 sentencing for that crime. Others have been charged and are
19 subject to proceedings in this case regarding human
20 trafficking, but there is a connection and the Rule 11 Plea
21 Agreement that Mr. Ford signed recognizes that connection.
22 These drugs were not distributed in some kind of vacuum, they
23 were distributed with awareness by Mr. Ford and others that
24 they were a means of enslaving women into performing commercial
25 sex acts and the Rule 11 Plea Agreement recognizes that very

1 connection. So the conduct that brings Mr. Ford to court today
2 is conduct that is reprehensible and requires a very strong
3 judicial response.

4 Unfortunately, this is not Mr. Ford's first contact
5 with the criminal justice system. The presentence
6 investigation report lists the prior convictions and they range
7 from possession of drugs to inciting or aiding, abetting
8 burning to illegal possession of firearms receiving and
9 concealing stolen property, other drug offenses, a variety of
10 driving offenses and that brings us to the current offense for
11 which he is to be sentenced today.

12 We spent a good deal of time considering the
13 sentencing guidelines which this Court does take into account.
14 That guideline range of 168 months to 210 months shows how
15 seriously the guideline calculation considers the variables
16 applicable to Mr. Ford's case. Mr. Ford is fortunate in that
17 he executed a Rule 11 Plea Agreement that caps his sentence
18 below the guidelines at 144 months. The defense seeks a lower
19 sentence than that pointing out that Mr. Ford has been and will
20 continue to wrestle with the demon of drug addiction. He's
21 been a drug addict. He claims he now understands the
22 counter-productive result of engaging in those kinds of
23 activities. He says he's back on the right side of life and
24 the law, spending more time with his family or trying to spend
25 more time with his family or recognizing the importance of

1 family. All of those impulses are of course very good
2 impulses. Defense speaks of redemption and the Court certainly
3 believes that defendants who have committed crimes are
4 redeemable.

5 At the same time, the Court has to fashion a sentence
6 based on facts and not hope. It certainly is the Court's hope
7 that Mr. Ford can turn the corner on a life that for the most
8 part has found him in courtrooms and in jails and prison, but
9 what is before the Court right now is a defendant who has
10 committed a terrible crime, contributed in a significant way to
11 the misery of others. Such a defendant needs to be subject to
12 a custodial sentence for a significant period of time, to
13 protect the public from further crimes of the defendant, deter
14 others who would imitate his conduct, vindicate the law that
15 has been violated here.

16 Ultimately, the Court's sentence has to constitute
17 just punishment. The Court does believe that a sentence of 144
18 months will be sufficient and not greater than necessary to
19 accomplish those goals. The Court does understand that it is
20 departing from a guidelines or varying from the guidelines. It
21 is doing so because the parties have agreed to cap the sentence
22 below the guidelines and the Court does believe taking into
23 account all the circumstances appropriate within the statute
24 that a sentence after 144 months will be sufficient, but not
25 greater than necessary to accomplish the statutes's sentencing

1 goals.

2 Therefore pursuant to the Sentencing Reform Act of
3 1984, considering the sentencing guidelines which are advisory
4 and not mandatory, have been having taken into account all the
5 factors that are contained in Title 18 United States Code,
6 Section 3553, the Court commits the defendant to the custody of
7 the United States Bureau of Prisons for a term of 144 months.

8 Upon release from imprisonment he will be placed on
9 supervised release for a term of three years. He must pay the
10 mandatory special assessment of 100 dollars. That's due
11 immediately. The Court waives imposition of a fine, cost of
12 incarceration, cost of supervision due to Mr. Ford's lack of
13 financial resources. Mandatory drug testing is ordered.

14 He must cooperate with the collection of a DNA sample
15 as directed by probation. He must abide by the standard
16 conditions of our Court when he's placed on supervised release
17 and also the following special conditions. He must submit to
18 substance abuse testing to determine if he's reverted to
19 illegal drug use and he must participate in a program of
20 substance abuse treatment, follow the rules of that program as
21 directed by probation. The Court believes that counts one,
22 two, three, four and five and seven of the second-superseding
23 indictment are supposed to be dismissed? Is that correct?

24 MS. FERNANDEZ-SILBER: Yes, your Honor. At this time
25 I would move to dismiss those counts.

1 MR. LONGSTREET: No objection from the defense.

2 THE COURT: All right. So those counts are
3 dismissed. Now is there any objection to the sentence?

4 MS. FERNANDEZ-SILBER: No objection.

5 MR. LONGSTREET: Respectfully, none from the defense.

6 THE COURT: All right. Mr. Ford, I'm going to tell
7 you about your appeal rights. What I tell you now doesn't
8 change the fact that you've executed a Rule 11 Plea Agreement
9 that contains a waiver of your appeal rights, but if you do
10 appeal, you have 14 days to do so. If you cannot afford an
11 attorney, I'll appoint one for you. The clerk of court will
12 prepare the necessary appeal paper on your behalf upon your
13 request.

14 I'm going to order that the presentence investigation
15 report be corrected in accordance with my rulings here today
16 and that a corrected copy be furnished to the United States
17 Bureau of Prisons and the United States Sentencing Commission.
18 All other copies of the report will remain confidential in
19 accordance with the practice of our Court. Is there anything
20 else?

21 MS. FERNANDEZ-SILBER: Not for the government.

22 MR. LONGSTREET: Nothing from the defense. Thank
23 you.

24 THE COURT: All right. Then that concludes our
25 hearing for today. My thanks to Ms. Sandusky and Mr. Yarbrough

1 for their assistance.

2 THE CLERK OF THE COURT: Court's adjourned.

3 MR. LONGSTREET: Oh, there is one issue.

4 THE COURT: All right. Go back on the record.

5 MR. LONGSTREET: About my client's placement. He
6 would like to be placed in the state of Michigan, umm, he would
7 like to be placed at Milan Correctional to be close to his
8 family, if that's possible.

9 THE COURT: All right. I have no objection to him
10 being lodged at Milan. I don't obviously direct where he is
11 lodged, but I have no objection to him being lodged there.

12 MR. LONGSTREET: Thank you.

13 THE COURT: Anything else?

14 MR. LONGSTREET: Nothing from the defense, thank you.

15 MS. FERNANDEZ-SILBER: No, thank you, your Honor.

16 THE COURT: Thank you.

17 THE CLERK OF THE COURT: Court's adjourned.

18 (Hearing concluded at 3:33 p.m.)

19 -- --- --

20

21

22

23

24

25

C E R T I F I C A T E

I, David B. Yarbrough, Official Court
Reporter, do hereby certify that the foregoing pages
comprise a true and accurate transcript of the
proceedings taken by me in this matter on Wednesday,
March 30th, 2022.

7/13/2022

Date

/s/ David B. Yarbrough

David B. Yarbrough,
(CSR, RPR, FCRR, RMR)
231 W. Lafayette Blvd.
Detroit, MI 48226